UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,983	02/20/2004	Robert S. Kolman	10030883-1	7150

7590 04/02/2007

AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Legal Department, DL 429
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 7599
Loveland, CO 80537-0599

EXAMINER	
SHRESTHA, KIRAN K	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2109	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/782,983	KOLMAN, ROBERT S.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kiran K. Shrestha	2109	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 February ~~0204~~ 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-43* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-43* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *20 February 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the original filing of February 20, 2004. Claims 1, 13, 20, and 32 are independent claims. Claims 1-43 are pending and have been considered below.

Specification

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds 150 words in length. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-19 are drawn to a computer program per se. A computer program is not a series of steps or acts and this is not a process. A computer program is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. A computer program is not a combination of substances and therefore not a compilation of matter. Thus, a computer program by itself does not fall within any of the four categories of invention. Therefore, Claims 1-19 are not statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 13, 14, 20, 21, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Lane** et al. (US 5704051 A).

Claim 1: Lane discloses a graphical user interface application for rendering graphical elements that are characterized by a plurality of element characteristics in an image rendering space on a display screen, said graphical user interface comprising:

a selection interface comprising a plurality of selectable graphical identifiers (secondary items such as "Washington", "Jefferson", "Madison", "Monroe", etc.) (Column 5, lines 12-21) each of which is associated with a respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics (items associated with secondary items) (Column 5, lines 42-46) and associated with a different unique rendering color (color coded for each of secondary items)(Column 5, lines 46-49) that is used when rendering said respective selectable graphical identifier when said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics associated with said respective selectable graphical identifier is selected for display (Column 5, lines 36-50);

an input interface which detects selection of any of said respective plurality of selectable graphical identifiers (for example: Jefferson is selected from the items)(Column 5, lines 37-38); and

a rendering function which, for each detected selected graphical identifier, renders elements characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics associated with said selected graphical identifier in said image rendering space of said display screen using said different unique rendering color associated with said selected graphical identifier (items associated with Jefferson are displayed in the same color as color of Jefferson secondary item and differentiated from the other secondary items)(Column 5, lines 36-50).

Claim 2: Lane discloses a graphical user interface application in accordance with claim 1, **Lane** further discloses upon detection by said input interface of a newly selected one of any of said plurality of selectable graphical identifiers (secondary items such as "Washington", "Jefferson", "Madison", "Monroe", etc.) (Column 5, lines 12-21) that are not currently selected, said rendering function renders elements characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics (items associated with secondary items) (Column 5, lines 42-46) associated with said newly selected graphical identifier in said image rendering space of said display screen using said different unique rendering color (color coded for each of secondary items)(Column 5, lines 46-49) associated with said newly selected graphical identifier (Fig. 4; Column 5, lines 36-450).

Claim 13: Lane discloses a graphical user interface displayable on a display screen, comprising: a user selection menu (see menu in Fig. 4) comprising a plurality of selectable graphical identifiers (for example: "Washington", "Jefferson", "Madison", "Monroe", etc.)(Column 5, lines 14-15) each of which is associated with a respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics (items associated with secondary items "Washington", "Jefferson", "Madison", "Monroe", etc.) (Column 5, lines 42-46) and associated with a different unique rendering color (color coded for each of secondary items) (Column 5, lines 46-49) that is used when rendering said respective selectable graphical identifier when said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics associated with said respective selectable graphical identifier is selected

for display (items associated with Jefferson are displayed in the same color as color of Jefferson secondary item and differentiated from the other secondary items)(Column 5, lines 36-50), wherein each of said selectable graphical identifiers are responsive to user selection input for selection of said respective graphical identifier and are responsive to user de-selection input for de-selection of said respective graphical identifier (Column 1, lines 44-53); and

an image rendering space which, for each selected graphical identifier, displays elements characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics associated with said selected graphical identifier in said image rendering space of said display screen using said different unique rendering color associated with said selected graphical identifier (items associated with Jefferson are displayed in the same color as color of Jefferson secondary item and differentiated from the other secondary items)(Column 5, lines 36-50), and does not display elements characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics associated with any of said unselected graphical identifiers in said image rendering space of said display screen (Column 3, lines 37-45).

Claim 14: Lane discloses a graphical user interface in accordance with claim 13, **Lane** further discloses "upon user selection input for selection of a newly selected graphical identifier, said image rendering space displays elements characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics (items associated with

secondary items) (Column 5, lines 42-46) associated with said newly selected graphical identifier using said different unique rendering color (color coded for each of secondary items)(Column 5, lines 46-49) associated with said newly selected graphical identifier ".

Claim 20: Lane discloses a method for rendering graphical elements that are characterized by a plurality of element characteristics in an image rendering space of a display screen, said method comprising the steps of: providing a plurality of selectable graphical identifiers (for example: "Washington", "Jefferson", "Madison", "Monroe", etc.)(Column 5, lines 14-15) each of which is associated with a respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics (items associated with secondary items "Washington", "Jefferson", "Madison", "Monroe", etc.) (Column 5, lines 42-46) and associated with a different unique rendering color that is used when rendering said respective selectable graphical identifier when said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics associated with said respective selectable graphical identifier is selected for display (items associated with Jefferson are displayed in the same color as color of Jefferson secondary item and differentiated from the other secondary items)(Column 5, lines 36-50);

detecting selection and/or de-selection (user selects one, wherein the original menu is removed and replaced with a second menu) (Column 1, lines 46-47) of any of said respective plurality of selectable graphical identifiers (Column 1, lines 44-53);

and for each detected selected graphical identifier, rendering elements characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics (items associated with secondary items "Washington", "Jefferson", "Madison", "Monroe", etc.) (Column 5, lines 42-46) associated with said selected graphical identifier in said image rendering space of said display screen using said different unique rendering color (color coded for each of secondary items)(Column 5, lines 46-49) associated with said selected graphical identifier (Column 5, lines 36-50).

Claim 21: Lane discloses a method in accordance with claim 20, **Lane** further discloses "upon detection by said input interface of a newly selected one of any of said plurality of selectable graphical identifiers (secondary items such as "Washington", "Jefferson", "Madison", "Monroe", etc.) (Column 5, lines 12-21) that are not currently selected, rendering elements characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics (items associated with secondary items) (Column 5, lines 42-46) associated with said newly selected graphical identifier in said image rendering space of said display screen using said different unique rendering color (color coded for each of secondary items)(Column 5, lines 46-49) associated with said newly selected graphical identifier" (Fig. 4; Column 5, lines 36-50).

Claim 32: Lane discloses a computer readable storage medium tangibly embodying program instructions implementing a method for rendering graphical elements that are characterized by a plurality of element characteristics in an image rendering space of a

display screen, said method comprising the steps of: providing a plurality of selectable graphical identifiers each of which is associated with a respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics (items associated with secondary items "Washington", "Jefferson", "Madison", "Monroe", etc.) (Column 5, lines 42-46) and associated with a different unique rendering color that is used when rendering said respective selectable graphical identifier when said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics associated with said respective selectable graphical identifier is selected for display (items associated with Jefferson are displayed in the same color as color of Jefferson secondary item and differentiated from the other secondary items) (Column 5, lines 46-50);

detecting selection and/or de-selection of any of said respective plurality of selectable graphical identifiers (Column 1, lines 44-53);

and for each detected selected graphical identifier, rendering elements characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics (items associated with secondary items "Washington", "Jefferson", "Madison", "Monroe", etc.) (Column 5, lines 42-46) associated with said selected graphical identifier in said image rendering space of said display screen using said different unique rendering color (color coded for each of secondary items)(Column 5, lines 46-49) associated with said selected graphical identifier (Column 5, lines 36-50).

Claim 33: Lane discloses the computer readable storage medium of claim 32, **Lane** further discloses upon detection by said input interface of a newly selected one of any of said plurality of selectable graphical identifiers (secondary items such as "Washington", "Jefferson", "Madison", "Monroe", etc.) (Column 5, lines 12-21) that are not currently selected, rendering elements characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics (items associated with secondary items) (Column 5, lines 42-46) associated with said newly selected graphical identifier in said image rendering space of said display screen using said different unique rendering color (color coded for each of secondary items)(Column 5, lines 46-49) associated with said newly selected graphical identifier (Fig. 4; Column 5, lines 36-50).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 3-12, 15-19, 22-31, and 34-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lane** et al. (US 5,704,051 A) in view of **Lee** et al. (US 7,017,122 B1).

Claim 3: Lane discloses a graphical user interface application in accordance with claim 2, **Lane** does not disclose "rendering function re-renders said newly selected graphical identifier using said different unique rendering color associated with said newly selected graphical identifier". **Lee** discloses that rendering function re-renders newly selected graphical identifier (menu items) (**Lee**, Column 4, lines 17-22) using said different unique rendering color associated with said newly selected graphical identifier (Fig. 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include re-rendering function to re-render the selected graphical identifier in **Lane**'s system. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently display with different color features using a menu item.

Claim 4: Lane discloses a graphical user interface application in accordance with claim 1, **Lane** does not teach "upon detection by said input interface of de-selection of any currently selected graphical identifiers, said rendering function removes from said image rendering space of said display screen any element that is not characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics associated with any of said remaining selected graphical identifiers". **Lee** does not mention "de-selection of any currently selected graphical identifiers, said rendering function removes from said image" but **Lee** does mention "if the step register is not of "1", that is, if more than two steps are displaced on the current screen, the current step menu is turned off (S20)" (Fig. 3; Column 3, lines 50-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include remove

function in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently free up screen space.

Claim 5: Lane and Lee disclose a graphical user interface application in accordance with claim 4, **Lane** does not teach "rendering function re-renders said de-selected graphical identifier using a default color" but **Lee** does teach displaying menu with own color (Column 3, lines 4-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include menu with own color in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently differentiate menu items.

Claim 6: Lane and Lee disclose a graphical user interface application in accordance with claim 3, **Lane** does not teach "upon detection by said input interface of de-selection of any currently selected graphical identifiers, said rendering function removes from said image rendering space of said display screen any element that is not characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics associated with any of said remaining selected graphical identifiers". **Lee** does not mention "de-selection of any currently selected graphical identifiers, said rendering function removes from said image" but **Lee** does mention "if the step register is not of "1", that is, if more than two steps are displaced on the current screen, the current step menu is turned off (S20)" (Fig. 3; Column 3, lines 50-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include remove function

in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently free up screen space.

Claim 7: Lane and Lee disclose a graphical user interface application in accordance with claim 6, **Lane** does not teach "rendering function re-renders said de-selected graphical identifier using a default color" but **Lee** does teach displaying menu with own color (Column 3, lines 4-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include menu with own color in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently differentiate menu items.

Claim 8: Lane discloses a graphical user interface application in accordance with claim 1, **Lane** does not teach "rendering function renders any element that is not characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics associated with any of said selected graphical identifiers in said image rendering space of said display screen using a default rendering color that is different from any of said different unique rendering colors associated with any of said selected graphical identifiers" but **Lee** does teach displaying menu with own color (Column 3, lines 4-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include menu with own color in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently differentiate menu items.

Claim 9: Lane and Lee disclose a graphical user interface application in accordance with claim 8, **Lane** further discloses "upon detection by said input interface of a newly selected one of any of said plurality of selectable graphical identifiers that are not currently selected, said rendering function re-renders elements characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics associated with said newly selected graphical identifier in said image rendering space of said display screen using said different unique rendering color associated with said newly selected graphical identifier" (Fig. 4).

Claim 10: Lane and Lee disclose a graphical user interface application in accordance with claim 9, **Lane** does not disclose "rendering function re-renders said newly selected graphical identifier using said different unique rendering color associated with said newly selected graphical identifier". **Lee** discloses that rendering function re-renders newly selected graphical identifier (menu items) (**Lee**, Column 4, lines 17-22) using said different unique rendering color associated with said newly selected graphical identifier (Fig. 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include re-rendering function to re-render the selected graphical identifier in **Lane**'s system. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently display with different color features using a menu item.

Claim 11: Lane and Lee disclose a graphical user interface application in accordance with claim 9, **Lee** further discloses "upon detection by said input interface of de-

selection of any currently selected graphical identifiers, said rendering function re-renders in said image rendering space of said display screen any element that is not characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics associated with any of said selected graphical identifiers using said default rendering color" (Fig. 3; Column 3, lines 4-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include graphical identifiers with own color in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently differentiate graphical identifiers.

Claim 12: Lane and Lee disclose a graphical user interface application in accordance with claim 11, **Lee** further discloses "rendering function re-renders said de-selected graphical identifier using said default color" (Column 3, lines 4-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include graphical identifiers with own color in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently differentiate graphical identifiers.

Claim 15: Lane discloses a graphical user interface in accordance with claim 14, **Lane** does not disclose "user selection menu displays said newly selected graphical identifier using said different unique rendering color associated with said newly selected graphical identifier". **Lee** discloses "user selection menu displays said newly selected graphical identifier using said different unique rendering color associated with said newly selected graphical identifier" (S32, Fig. 5). Therefore, it would have been obvious

to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include displaying newly selected graphical identifier in unique color in **Lane**'s system. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently display with different color features using a menu item.

Claim 16: Lane discloses a graphical user interface in accordance with claim 13, **Lane** does not teach "user selection input for de-selection of a currently selected graphical identifier, any element that is not characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics associated with any of said remaining selected graphical identifiers is removed from said image rendering space". **Lee** does not mention "de-selection of any currently selected graphical identifiers, said rendering function removes from said image" but **Lee** does mention "if the step register is not of "1", that is, if more than two steps are displaced on the current screen, the current step menu is turned off (S20)" (Fig. 3; Column 3, lines 50-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include remove function in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently free up screen space.

Claim 17: Lane and Lee disclose a graphical user interface in accordance with claim 16, **Lee** further discloses "user selection menu re-displays said de-selected graphical identifier using a default color" (Column 3, lines 4-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to

include graphical identifiers with own color in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently differentiate graphical identifiers.

Claim 18: Lane and Lee disclose a graphical user interface in accordance with claim 15, **Lane** does not teach "user selection input for de-selection of a currently selected graphical identifier, any element that is not characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics associated with any of said remaining selected graphical identifiers is removed from said image rendering space". **Lee** does not mention "de-selection of any currently selected graphical identifiers, said rendering function removes from said image" but **Lee** does mention "if the step register is not of "1", that is, if more than two steps are displaced on the current screen, the current step menu is turned off (S20)" (Fig. 3; Column 3, lines 50-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include remove function in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently free up screen space.

Claim 19: Lane and Lee disclose a graphical user interface in accordance with claim 18; **Lee** further discloses "user selection menu re-displays said de-selected graphical identifier using a default color" (Column 3, lines 4-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include graphical identifiers with own color in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently differentiate graphical identifiers.

Claim 22: Lane discloses a method in accordance with claim 21, **Lane** does not disclose "re-rendering said newly selected graphical identifier using said different unique rendering color associated with said newly selected graphical identifier". **Lee** discloses that rendering function re-renders newly selected graphical identifier (menu items) (**Lee**, Column 4, lines 17-22) using said different unique rendering color associated with said newly selected graphical identifier (Fig. 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include re-rendering function to re-render the selected graphical identifier in **Lane**'s system. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently display with different color features using a menu item.

Claim 23: Lane discloses a method in accordance with claim 20, **Lane** does not disclose "detection by said input interface of de-selection of any currently selected graphical identifiers, removing from said image rendering space of said display screen any element that is not characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics associated with any of said remaining selected graphical identifiers". **Lee** does not mention "de-selection of any currently selected graphical identifiers, said rendering function removes from said image" but **Lee** does mention "if the step register is not of "1", that is, if more than two steps are displaced on the current screen, the current step menu is turned off (S20)" (Fig. 3; Column 3, lines 50-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention was made to include remove function in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently free up screen space.

Claim 24: Lane and Lee disclose a method in accordance with claim 23, **Lee** further discloses "re-rendering said de-selected graphical identifier using a default color" (Column 3, lines 4-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include graphical identifiers with own color in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently differentiate graphical identifiers.

Claim 25: Lane and Lee disclose a method in accordance with claim 22, **Lane** does not teach "upon detection by said input interface of de-selection of any currently selected graphical identifiers, removing from said image rendering space of said display screen any element that is not characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics associated with any of said remaining selected graphical identifiers". **Lee** does not mention "de-selection of any currently selected graphical identifiers, said rendering function removes from said image" but **Lee** does mention "if the step register is not of "1", that is, if more than two steps are displaced on the current screen, the current step menu is turned off (S20)" (Fig. 3; Column 3, lines 50-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include remove function in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently free up screen space.

Claim 26: Lane and Lee disclose a method in accordance with claim 25, **Lee** further discloses "re-rendering said de-selected graphical identifier using a default color" (Column 3, lines 4-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include graphical identifiers with own color in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently differentiate graphical identifiers.

Claim 27: Lane discloses a method in accordance with claim 20, **Lane** does not teach "rendering any element that is not characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics associated with any of said selected graphical identifiers in said image rendering space of said display screen using a default rendering color that is different from any of said different unique rendering colors associated with any of said selected graphical identifiers", but **Lee** does teach displaying menu with own color (Column 3, lines 4-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include menu with own color in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently differentiate menu items.

Claim 28: Lane and Lee disclose a method in accordance with claim 27, **Lane** further discloses "upon detection by said input interface of a newly selected one of any of said plurality of selectable graphical identifiers that are not currently selected, re-rendering elements characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element

characteristics associated with said newly selected graphical identifier in said image rendering space of said display screen using said different unique rendering color associated with said newly selected graphical identifier" (Fig. 4).

Claim 29: Lane and Lee disclose a method in accordance with claim 28, **Lane** does not disclose "re-rendering said newly selected graphical identifier using said different unique rendering color associated with said newly selected graphical identifier". **Lee** discloses that rendering function re-renders newly selected graphical identifier (menu items) (**Lee**, Column 4, lines 17-22) using said different unique rendering color associated with said newly selected graphical identifier (Fig. 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include re-rendering function to re-render the selected graphical identifier in **Lane**'s system. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently display with different color features using a menu item.

Claim 30: Lane and Lee disclose a method in accordance with claim 28, **Lee** further discloses "upon detection by said input interface of de-selection of any currently selected graphical identifiers, re-rendering in said image rendering space of said display screen any element that is not characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics associated with any of said selected graphical identifiers using said default rendering color" (Fig. 3; Column 3, lines 4-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to include graphical identifiers with own color in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently differentiate graphical identifiers.

Claim 31: Lane and Lee disclose a method in accordance with claim 30, **Lee** further discloses "re-rendering said de-selected graphical identifier using said default color" (Column 3, lines 4-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include graphical identifiers with own color in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently differentiate graphical identifiers.

Claim 34: Lane discloses the computer readable storage medium of claim 33, **Lane** does not disclose "re-rendering said newly selected graphical identifier using said different unique rendering color associated with said newly selected graphical identifier". **Lee** discloses that rendering function re-renders newly selected graphical identifier (menu items) (**Lee**, Column 4, lines 17-22) using said different unique rendering color associated with said newly selected graphical identifier (Fig. 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include re-rendering function to re-render the selected graphical identifier in **Lane**'s system. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently display with different color features using a menu item.

Claim 35: Lane discloses the computer readable storage medium of claim 32, **Lane** does not disclose "upon detection by said input interface of de-selection of any currently selected graphical identifiers, removing from said image rendering space of said display screen any element that is not characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics associated with any of said remaining selected graphical identifiers". **Lee** does not mention "de-selection of any currently selected graphical identifiers, said rendering function removes from said image" but **Lee** does mention "if the step register is not of "1", that is, if more than two steps are displaced on the current screen, the current step menu is turned off (S20)" (Fig. 3; Column 3, lines 50-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include remove function in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently free up screen space.

Claim 36: Lane and Lee disclose the computer readable storage medium of claim 35, **Lee** further discloses "re-rendering said de-selected graphical identifier using a default color" (Column 3, lines 4-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include graphical identifiers with own color in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently differentiate graphical identifiers.

Claim 37: Lane and Lee disclose the computer readable storage medium of claim 35, **Lane** does not disclose "upon detection by said input interface of de-selection of any

currently selected graphical identifiers, removing from said image rendering space of said display screen any element that is not characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics associated with any of said remaining selected graphical identifiers". **Lee** does not mention "de-selection of any currently selected graphical identifiers, said rendering function removes from said image" but **Lee** does mention "if the step register is not of "1", that is, if more than two steps are displaced on the current screen, the current step menu is turned off (S20)" (Fig. 3; Column 3, lines 50-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include remove function in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently free up screen space.

Claim 38: Lane and Lee disclose the computer readable storage medium of claim 37, **Lee** further discloses "re-rendering said de-selected graphical identifier using a default color" (Column 3, lines 4-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include graphical identifiers with own color in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently differentiate graphical identifiers.

Claim 39: Lane discloses the computer readable storage medium of claim 32, **Lane** does not teach "rendering any element that is not characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics associated with any of said selected

graphical identifiers in said image rendering space of said display screen using a default rendering color that is different from any of said different unique rendering colors associated with any of said selected graphical identifiers", but **Lee** does teach displaying menu with own color (Column 3, lines 4-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include menu with own color in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently differentiate menu items.

Claim 40: Lane and Lee disclose the computer readable storage medium of claim 39, **Lane** further discloses "upon detection by said input interface of a newly selected one of any of said plurality of selectable graphical identifiers that are not currently selected, re-rendering elements characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics associated with said newly selected graphical identifier in said image rendering space of said display screen using said different unique rendering color associated with said newly selected graphical identifier " (Fig. 4).

Claim 41: Lane and Lee disclose the computer readable storage medium of claim 40, **Lane** does not disclose "re-rendering said newly selected graphical identifier using said different unique rendering color associated with said newly selected graphical identifier". **Lee** discloses that rendering function re-renders newly selected graphical identifier (menu items) (**Lee**, Column 4, lines 17-22) using said different unique rendering color associated with said newly selected graphical identifier (Fig. 6). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include re-rendering function to re-render the selected graphical identifier in **Lane**'s system. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently display with different color features using a menu item.

Claim 42: Lane and Lee disclose the computer readable storage medium of claim 40, **Lee** further discloses "upon detection by said input interface of de-selection of any currently selected graphical identifiers, re-rendering in said image rendering space of said display screen any element that is not characterized by said respective one or more of said plurality of element characteristics associated with any of said selected graphical identifiers using said default rendering color" (Fig. 3; Column 3, lines 4-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include graphical identifiers with own color in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently differentiate graphical identifiers.

Claim 43: Lane and Lee disclose the computer readable storage medium of claim 42, **Lee** further discloses "re-rendering said de-selected graphical identifier using said default color" (Column 3, lines 4-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include graphical identifiers with own color in **Lane**'s systems. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently differentiate graphical identifiers.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Exr. Kiran K. Shrestha whose telephone number is (571) 270-1691. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James W. Myhre, can be reached on (571) 270-1065. The fax phone number for Formal or Official faxes to Technology Center 2100 is (571) 273-3800. Draft or Informal faxes, which will not be entered in the application, may be submitted directly to the examiner at (571) 273-6722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-3600.

K.S.

KS

March 28, 2007

James W. Myhre

Supervisory Primary Examiner